

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated April 19, 2005. Claims 1-3 and 5-8 are currently pending in the application. As indicated above, Claims 1 and 6 have been amended.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has now rejected Claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by *Dickie* (U.S. 2003/0041206), Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Dickie* in view of *Block et al.* (U.S. 5,113,403), and Claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Dickie* in view of *Vossler* (U.S. 6,104,606). Additionally, the Examiner has again objected to the use of the term “rotatably”.

With regard to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, the Examiner asserts that the term “optical projection system,” as recited in independent Claim 6, has no antecedent basis. As indicated above, Claim 6 has been amended to remove the term “projection”. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

With regard to the rejection of independent Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by *Dickie*, as indicated above, independent Claim 1 has amended to recite that the beam projects information from the portable terminal cradled within the cradle housing, which clearly is not taught in *Dickie*, as the alleged “portable terminal” in *Dickie* is completely enclosed within the alleged “cradle housing” of *Dickie*. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 1 is patentably distinct from *Dickie*.

Additionally, with regard to the Examiner’s rejection of Claim 8, the Examiner asserts that FIG. 3 of *Dickie* shows that only a rear portion of a lower section of the cradle housing is

retractable within the desk-top housing. However, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is incorrect.

More specifically, FIG. 3 clearly shows that when the latch is slid to the right, the PDA 102 is pushed down against the lower section of the cradle housing 300, which is then completely concealed within the lap top computer (i.e., the desk-top housing). Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection to Claim 8 be withdrawn.

Additionally, with regard to the Examiner's objection to the term "rotatably", which the Examiner asserts is grammatically incorrect, it is again respectfully submitted that the Examiner is incorrect. As previously presented, "rotatably" is an adverb modifying the verb "mounted". Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the term should not be "rotatable" as indicated by the Examiner, as this would in fact be grammatically incorrect.

Further, with regard to the Examiner statement that the term "rotatably" as used in the phrase "rotatably mounted" is not clearly defined, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is incorrect. That is, it is respectfully submitted that, to one skilled in the art, it is clear that the term "rotatably" is modifier of a verb, i.e., mounted, which indicates in this case that the mounting is done such that the cradle housing is mounted to be rotatable within the desk-top housing. This is further evidenced by the Examiner's assertion that the term should be "rotatable".

Finally, it is respectfully submitted that "rotatably" is common term of art in patent claim drafting and is commonly used as claim language. More specifically, by searching the term "rotatably" in the U.S.P.T.O. database it is noted that the term is used in over 290,000 patents and over 50,000 published applications. Accordingly, at least for the reasons stated above, it is again respectfully requested that the Examiner's objection be withdrawn.

Based on the arguments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 2-3 and 5-8, they are likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence on

Claim 1. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of dependent Claims 2-3 and 5-8 are respectfully requested.

In view of the preceding amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims, namely Claims 1-3 and 5-8 are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant(s)

DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP

333 Earle Ovington Blvd.

Uniondale, New York 11553

Tel: (516) 228-8484

Fax: (516) 228-8516

PJF/DMO/dr